| 1   | Original Research Article  |
|---|--|
| 2   |  |
| 3   | <b>Deaf Machine Theory</b>   |
| 4   |  |
| 5   |  |
| 6   | Abstract   |
| 7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15 | In this manuscript-paper, the author presents an abstract model represents an ideal conceptual model to describe one edge of computation theory. The deaf machine is of a computable machine that is passive to inputs. The model is conceptually a deaf machine that is basically an automaton that has does not have any acceptance state. The Deaf machine may have one or many more normal states or and can even have infinite states (uncountable normal states). The deaf mMachine can not recognize any languages, either formal or other informal. So, there is at least one The Proposed model is a finite state machine FSM without the accept state, and cannot recognize any language. neither accepts an empty string E. |
| 16  |  |
| 17  | Keywords: Theory of Computation, Computer Science, Deaf Machine, Automata, FSM.  |

18

19

20

## 1. Deaf Machine in Computation Theory

The computational theory in computer science examines the possibility of solving 21 problems efficiently through a computer and also examines what the computer can calculate 22 23 automatecompute currently and what they can develop to solve problems. Computational theory deals with the mathematical models of computing. To produce a systematic The study 24 of computation, computer scientists form an is aided by abstract mathematical models of 25 computers called model of computation [2, 3]. One of these models is the deterministic finite 26 27 automata DFA that works with finite state machine FSM. This model consists of five tuples, the first tuple is represents the set of states that is governed by rules of transition 28 29 from one state to another according to input symbol, with the movement being is done described by transition function. As an example the transition function of moving the process 30 31 from state x to the next state y, when the input symbol is 1 is given by  $\delta(x, 1) = y.[4, 5]$  from definition: Let machine M is beadDeterministic fFinite aAutomaton then M has adescribed by 32 the 5-tuple,  $(Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$ , [6, 7] consisting that consists of: 33

- a finite set of states (Q)
- a finite set of input symbols called the alphabet  $(\Sigma)$
- **36** a transition function  $(\delta : Q \times \Sigma \rightarrow Q)$
- **37** an initial or start state  $(q_0 \in Q)$
- 38 a set of accept states ( $F \subseteq Q$ )

39 Let For the machine M shown figure 1, If alphabet of the machine  $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$ , then:



## Figure 1- Machine M.

## 42 $M = (\{x\}, \{1\}, \delta, x, \{\})$ with 43 $\delta$ :



44  $\delta(x, 1) = x$ ,

40

41

45 In this case, the transition function represents the movement from one state x to another except the case of machine M x itself on input 1. For the deaf machine, The important part 46 that is presented here, is the accept states set, it is allowed to be  $\{\}$  or  $\phi$  (there is not accept 47 states) [1]. This thing is the problem and the solution at the same time, the problem is the 48 machine does not recognize any language neither empty string E nor the empty language. As 49 an example The deaf machine functioningis is analogous to the healthy human ears, but the 50 person does not that can hear but cannot recognize any the human language unknown to the 51 person. One example of application of this model is the to halt or break function in 52 programming. 53

54 He can hear but he cannot understand. From the other side the solution is The similarity lies 55 in the DFA machine that has does not have any acceptance state but it accomplishes generates a model that represents the deaf machine in computation theory [4, 5]. Because this abstract 56 57 model represents an ideal conceptual model to describe one edge of computation theory. The deaf machine is an automaton that has not any acceptance state, figure 1 for example. Deaf 58 machine may have one or many normal states or even have infinite states (uncountable 59 normal states) [8, 9 and 10]. The deaf machine can not recognize any languages, either formal 60 61 or other.

- 62
- -
- 63

## 64 **2.** Conclusion

A model of a computable machine that is basically deaf to the inputs is presented in the
paper. The proposed machine does not have Deaf machine is abstract model represents an
ideal conceptual model to describe one edge of computation theory. The deaf machine is an
automaton that has doesnot have any acceptance state. Deaf machine may have one or many
<u>morenormal states or can</u>even have infinite states (uncountable normal states). The deaf
machine can not recognize any languages, either formal or otherinformal. This leads to

| 71<br>72<br>73<br>74 | conclude that there is at least one Basic idea proposed in the paper is the concept of the finite state machine FSM without acceptance state, cannot recognize any language neither accepts an empty string. One example of application of this model is to halt or break function in programming. |
|----------------------|--|
| 75                   |  |
| 76                   |  |
| 77                   |  |
| 78                   |  |
| 79<br>80             | 3. References  |
| 81                   | 1. Sipser. 2013, Introduction to the Theory of Computation, 3 <sup>rd</sup> edition, Cengage Learning, P   |
| 82                   | 36.  |
| 83                   | 2. Rabin 'Michael O. June 2012. Turing, Church, Gödel, Computability, Complexity and   |
| 84                   | Randomization: A Personal View.  |
| 85                   | 3. AHO, A. V., SETHI, R., AND ULLMAN, J. D.1986, Compilers: Principles, Techniques,  |
| 86                   | Tools. Addison-Wesley.   |
| 87                   | 4. Donald Monk. 1976. Mathematical Logic. Springer Verlag. ISBN 9780387901701.   |
| 88                   | 5.4. Henry Gordon Rice. 1953. "Classes of Recursively Enumerable Sets and Their  |
| 89                   | Decision Problems". Transactions of the American Mathematical Society. American  |
| 90                   | Mathematical Society. 74 (2): 358-366. JSTOR 1990888. doi: 10.2307/1990888.  |
| 91                   | 6. LUBY, M. Pseudo randomness and Cryptographic Applications. Princeton University   |
| 92                   | Press, 1996.   |
| 93                   | 7. LUND, C., FORTNOW, L., KARLOFF, H., AND NISAN, N. Algebraic methods for   |
| 94                   | interactive proof systems. Journal of the ACM 39, 4 (1992), 859-868.   |
| 95                   | 8. MILLER, G. L. Riemann's hypothesis and tests for primality. Journal of Computer and   |
| 96                   | System Sciences 13 (1976), 300-317.  |
| 97                   | 9. NIVEN, I., AND ZUCKERMAN, H. S. An Introduction to the Theory of Numbers, 4 <sup>th</sup>   |
| 98                   | ed. John Wiley& Sons, 1980.  |
| 99                   | 10.5. S. Barry Cooper (2004). Computability Theory. Chapman and Hall/CRC. ISBN 1-  |
| 100                  | 58488-237-9.   |